

REMARKS

Claim 1 calls for establishing at least two simultaneous sessions at a given packet data protocol address and separately assessing charges for each of those sessions.

As explained in the Background of the present application, a mobile subscriber may establish up to sixteen sessions through a given data protocol address. See the specification at page 1, lines 12-14. A plurality of data sessions may include at any given time a mixture of streaming audio, streaming video, multimedia, and data services. The plurality of sessions may all be happening at the same time at a given address 12 as indicated in Figure 1. Thus, in some embodiments, the idea is to charge for each of these sessions even though they are ongoing simultaneously.

The cited reference to Korpela, applied against claim 1, addresses the situation where the same amount of data may be transferred over a long amount of time or over a relatively short amount of time. See column 3, line 63, through column 4, line 4. To address this situation, information about the call may be stored either as time units or data units. See column 5, line 19. In the material cited by the Examiner in the office action, it is indicated that both time units and data units may be simultaneously registered. This offers a better solution according to the inventor of the cited reference, probably for the reasons discussed previously in columns 3 and 4 where the user may burst a large amount of data in a very short amount of time and still may use a lot of bandwidth.

Thus, the cited reference is not talking about simultaneous sessions, but simultaneously recording both amounts of data and time information. As such, the cited reference is distinguishable from the invention set forth in claim 1. On the same analysis, the claims dependent on claim 1, claim 7 and its dependent claims, and claim 13 and its dependent claims, likewise, distinguish over the cited reference.

Claim 21 calls for assessing mobility management information for call origination and call termination and using that mobility management information to assess a charge for a telephonic communication.

Claim 21 was rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Shobatake. Mobility management information is discussed in the present specification at page 5, lines 23 *et seq.* There it is explained that mobility management is a relation between the mobile station and the


Universal Terrestrial Radio Access network that is used to set up, maintain, and release the various physical channels.

Mobility management is part of the General Packet Radio Service and has nothing to do with the mobility database 407 referenced in column 6 of the cited reference. The cited reference has nothing to do with a Universal Terrestrial Radio Access network or the General Packet Radio Service and simply talks about mobility, not mobility management information. Moreover, the reference does not use the mobility data base to assess information for both call origination and call termination.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 21, claim 24, and claim 27 and their dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 28, 2005



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]